# LANGUAGE CONSEQUENCES OF MIGRATION OF ROMANI SPEAKERS FROM SLOVAKIA TO GREAT BRITAIN AND BACK: THE CHANGE OF PARADIGM OF TOWN NAMES IN TWO ROMANI DIALECTS[1]

## JAN ČERVENKA

*PhDr. Jan Červenka, Ph.D.,Department of Central European Studies – Seminar of Romani Studies (Charles University, Faculty of Arts),nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38, Praha 1, Czech Republic; e-mail: jan.cervenka@ff.cuni.cz*

The article focuses on language changes in Romani spoken by Slovak emigrants to England and re-emigrants to Slovakia or by people residing alternately in both the countries as the case may be. The changes are monitored separately in two Romani groups: the so called Slovak Roma (speakers of the Northern-Central dialect of Romani) and the Vlax Roma (speakers of the Slovak variety of the Lovari dialect). I address the way the language is influenced both by the changes of the environment and lifestyle and the changes of the contact language. I mostly focus on adult respondents whose contact language has really changed during their life. I concentrate on one striking and unexpected change: the change of the system according to which toponyms, specifically town names, are created in Romani. First I submit the survey of the system in the pre-emigration situation that has not been systematically published for either of the examined dialects. Further on I introduce the changes the described system has gone through in both the dialects due to the influence of migration to Western Europe and I cautiously attempt to suggest interpretation of the examined phenomenon.

## 0. INTRODUCTION

Romani is a language in which language contact always plays a very important role[2]. There even exists an opinion that there are no (adult) monolingual Romani speakers

---

2    Compare e.g. Matras 1995, Pintér and Menyhárt (2005), specifically for the dialects addressed in my article then Kubaník, Sadílková, and Červenka (2013) and Hajská (2015).

in the world, while on the other hand the knowledge of Romani among members of majorities is rare. Matras (2002: 191), for example, writes: "With the exception of very young children, there are no monolingual speakers of Romani." And he adds (Matras, 2002: 238): "All adult speakers of Romani are fully bilingual or even multi-lingual."

The process of Romani re/e/migration from Slovakia (and the Czech Republic) to Western countries has been in progress especially since the 2nd half of the 1990s and takes on many different forms[3]. This brings a great number of changes on all linguistic levels into Romani. Just to address them briefly would mean to exceed the limits of one article, therefore from the very beginning I will concentrate on one selected phenomenon and its realization in Romani spoken by two different communities. The topic is formation and usage of toponyms, specifically names of villages and towns. There are several reasons that led to my choice of this subject: The change in the above mentioned sphere was the least expected before the beginning of the research and at the same time I consider the phenomenon interesting from the anthropological point of view. Moreover, my article may be the first systematic reconstruction of its realization in both the Romani dialects in the pre-emigration era.

### 0.1. Communities
The language material obtained separately in two communities was chosen for the purposes of this text. One is the community of so called "Slovak Roma", the Northern-Central Romani dialect speakers. The other is the community of Vlax Roma, the speakers of the Eastern-Slovak variety of the Lovari (Northern-Vlax) Romani dialect. Each of the two communities has a different language background and different original and target language situation, therefore on each investigated linguistic level I am trying to analyse the language material separately for each community and compare them. For the purposes of this text I take into account especially the language of adult Romani migrants, i.e. people whose contact language has demonstrably changed and who have not socialized into the Romani-English language environment[4].

### a) Community of Northern-Central Romani speakers
The source of data for Northern-Central Romani is the related community coming from a large settlement in East Slovakia. The community is partly interrelated with Roma in a larger Czech town where a group of Roma moved from Slovakia after World War II. Migration from both the communities (the Czech and Slovak branches) to Western Europe began on a greater scale in about 2005. Some people migrate between Slovakia and Britain repeatedly, some returned after a longer time[5]. The analysed conversations were realized also with persons who had not migrated. The migration destinations in Great Britain are towns in Northern England, especially Sheffield and Peterborough[6].

---

3   From the existing wide literature I have chosen a text referring exactly to one of the communities I investigate: Dobruská 2017.

4   I mention this fact as I do not have enough data available from younger respondents for the investigated phenomenon – not because there are signals of remarkably different realization of the given phenomenon in Roma whose language socialization was realised in Britain.

5   For more details about migration of this group see a very useful text: Dobruská 2017.

6   For ethical reasons it would be possible to make also the destinations anonymous, but there are several arguments against: 1) The towns are big enough and the Roma living there are of different origins. 2) According to many narratives and their behaviour in social networks the Roma in these towns do not feel stigmatized as Roma. 3) The very names of these localities are the main subject of this article.

*b) Community of Vlax Romani speakers*

The investigated Vlax Roma community originally came from the area of Prešov and Košice, nowadays these Roma have settled in British Leicester. According to some respondents there are more than one thousand of them there. The first larger departures of Vlax Roma living in the Prešov housing estate were observed around 2005 – 2006. Massive migration waves of Roma from the investigated group across different localities, however, followed later, in 2007 – 2010, and it was Leicester where most of these Roma settled. The whole community is more or less interconnected by various family relations. Although they live in very dispersed places and are not concentrated, the members of the community meet at different venues: at balls, celebrations, favourite shops, church, etc.

## 0.2. Source, methodology, acknowledgement

Direct thematizing in targeted conversations is not very practical for most topics I investigate. E.g. Červenka (2006: 17) analyses "in the vast majority (...) natural speech, i.e. little structured conversations on topics other than language itself." The reason is that they bring (op. cit.: 16) "little influence by the language of questions, both in Romani and in the majority language. This is a very important advantage for the Romani studies as I have already mentioned the helpfulness of communicative respondents that may be to the detriment of research. (...) Natural language structures get noticed as they are really produced by the speakers without their thinking on the meta-language level."

Recordings of conversations on topics other than language, following of communication in social media, etc. turn out to be suitable sources for my current subject. For the purposes of this text I even sometimes deliberately watched the recordings with the migration themes from another point of view than the interviewers who made them, which led me to the main topic of this article, I compared recordings from different periods and localities and interviewed the interviewers who had made the recordings with the theme of migration. I would like to thank especially our Romani respondents, but also the investigators without whose recordings and valuable consultations my text would never have been realized. These are especially Petra Dobruská, Markéta Hajská, Zuzana Znamenáčková, and Jan Ort, and also I would like to thank Františka Dvorská.

# 1. TOPONYMS: NAMES OF VILLAGES AND TOWNS

## 1.1. "Conventional" form of toponyms

*a) Situation in Northern-Central Romani*

The traditional form of toponyms in Northern-Central Romani has been well known among Czech Romani scholars since the founder of the Czech Romani Studies Milena Hübschmannová (1933 – 2005) described them. The whole system, however, must be reconstructed from partial references of her students. For example Červenka (1996: 109–110) gives a clear but brief characteristic of the morphosyntactic behaviour of village names also rendering the hübschmannian distance between the village names in the area of former Czechoslovakia and the behaviour of village names in other countries:

"In the case of Czech and Slovak villages the meanings *to the village of XY* and *in*

*the village of XY* are conventionally expressed in the locative and *from the village of XY* in the ablative, in foreign places, however, the same happens in the prepositional nominative (...)

Established Romani names, however, exist for the villages where Roma have lived. (...) Traditional names, often originating from Hungarian[7] village names (*e Bartva* – "Bardejov"[8]), are slowly disappearing and new ones are being formed (*o Bardejovos*). Readers may not always understand the traditional name."

The origin and form of these toponyms (and the behaviour of toponyms for Czech and Slovak villages) are best rendered by Šebková and Žlnayová (1999[9]: 194–195):

" (...) even in Romani there exist the original – Romani names of towns and villages.

Romani names of towns and villages in Bohemia and Moravia are similar to Czech names:

**Praha** – *Prague* **Prahate** – *in Prague; to Prague,* **Brna/Brnos** – *Brno* **Brnate/Brnoste** – *in Brno; to Brno,* **Mosti** – *Most* **Mostende** – *in Most; to Most,* **Usti** – *Ústí nad Labem* **Ustende** – *in Ústí; to Ústí* (...)

**Pardubica/Pardubici** – *Pardubice* **Pardubicate/Pardubicende** – *in Pardubice; to Pardubice* (...)

Names of many Slovak towns, however, are different in Romani as they originate in Hungarian or German historical names. These names have been preserved especially in the vicinity of the given place. Roma from more remote areas then usually use the contemporary Slovak names. Therefore we would like to familiarize you with a few names of some more important Slovak towns sounding different in Romani!

**Požoma** – *Bratislava,* **Požomate** – *in Bratislava,* **Požomu** – *to Bratislava,* **Sombata** – *Trnava,* **Sombatate** – *in Trnava,* **Sombatu** – *to Trnava,* **Uheľa** – *Nové Mesto nad Váhom,* **Uheľate** – *in Nové Mesto nad Váhom,* **Uheľu** – *to Nové Mesto nad Váhom,* (...) **Kaša** – *Košice,* **Kašate** – *in Košice; to Košice,* **Perješis** – *Prešov,* **Perješiste** – *in Prešov; to Prešov* (...)

*Dialectologic note:*

While in the *Western-Slovak* and *Central-Slovak* varieties the names of towns and villages are solely feminine, in the *Eastern-Slovak* variety they can also be masculine."

Regional varieties of morphosyntactic alignments of toponyms, a theme also closely related to my subject, are addressed by the authors elsewhere (op. cit.: 192): "In the area of Košice, in Spiš, and elsewhere prepositional cases (often alternatively besides the locative) occur when a place is specified with the use of a name of a town or village: **ke Kaša, ke Praha** – *to Košice, to Prague*".

Description of the origin, form, and behaviour of toponyms is further described by Červenka (2006: 23):

"In the Northern-Central Romani we have both cases[10]: both the 'standard' adaptation of the form of the local proprium differing from the contemporary (...) name of

---

7    The then text needs to be amended by adding also the German origin (Note 2017). Another source of the Romani form of a name is mentioned by Červenka (2006: 90) – the Romani form *Ceplička* ("Liptovská Teplička") is borrowed neither from the official form of the name nor from other languages but from the local Slovak dialect.

8    In accordance with the linguistic convention I use quotation marks to mark a translation or meaning of expressions I mention.

9    See also a much briefer similar extract by Šebková, Žlnayová 1998: 91, 103.

10   The claim refers to the title of the section "Adaptation from different forms of local propria vs adaptation from the standard form with the gender or number conversion." (Note 2017).

the place by gender or number and the adaptation with a gender or number conversion. Thus for example, I place the contrast of the expressions for the meaning "from Košice": *Kašatar* x *Košicendar* into lexicon, as Romani adopts different forms of the town name – Hungarian *Kaša* and Slovak *Košice*[11] in each of the cases. On the other hand I place a seemingly similar phenomenon – the expression for the meaning "in Sučany": *Sučaňate* – into morphology – specifically adaptation – as Romani adopts the name of the village as the feminine singular. This of course applies supposing *Sučaňa* in this traditional territory of the Slovak nationals was not an ingrained Hungarian name and not even a common local form of a Slovak name; otherwise it would be an analogy to the first case."

As for the gender of the adopted toponyms Červenka (2006: 37) unlike Šebková and Žlnayová discovers also masculine name forms in central Slovakia: "Specifically in Liptov, where there is no doubt about the Central-Slovak variety still being spoken, the inhabitants of some towns, both younger and the older generations, use masculine forms when using the names of their towns: *Ružomberkos* – Ružomberok, *Mikulašis* – Liptovský Mikuláš. The authors probably worked with data from the Southwest part of Central Slovakia. It is also true that the tendency to adopt a name of a village as the feminine singular is strong even in the regions I investigate, both in the West (*Kysuca* – Kysucké Nové Mesto, *Sučaňa* – Sučany) and in the easternmost part of the area: (*Važca* – Važec)."

From among the examples mentioned in the quotations below (op. cit.: 37) especially the expression *Pozamkos Sklabinsko* (Sklabinský Podzámok) is interesting. It has been captured not only for its masculine gender but also for its atypical multiword form probably caused by the context as Romani toponyms are usually oneword. This proves also another example of a toponym (op. cit.): *o Revuci* ("Liptovské Revúce").[12]

Very valuable examples then are the two forms of the name Auschwitz: *Švenčina, Onšvenčina*, captured in the World War II memories of one person. They represent quite a rare proof of spontaneous naming of towns in foreign countries. Both forms have the proper form of a Romani feminine. At the same time they are interesting for the fluctuation of their form. Upon closer examination of the whole conversation (op. cit: 131), however, it is clear that the narrator, who knows the place only by (distant) report, is gradually correcting the name. The form *Onšvenčina* is then repeated. This is another example allowing us to hypothesize here that toponyms within the given locality (community), and especially the ones denominating villages somehow connected with the life of the local Roma, usually have absolutely stabilized forms. In Northern-Central Romani the names of a specific locality may vary – both in their lexical form (by borrowing from the Slovak, Hungarian, or German name) and the grammatical categories (gender, number) – this fact, however, cannot hinder the above mentioned hypothesis as it seems that such varieties mostly differ only from community to community – they do not vary within a community or even within the idiolect of an individual.

---

11  *Kaša* is naturally adopted as feminine and singular, the ending -e in *Košice* suitably mergeswith the plural morpheme of the indirect root *–en-* although the nominative of the proper plural loanword would be *Košici*. The nominative of these words, however, is more rare and can be even replaced by a quotational word (my own term) *Košice* (so called Code switch).

12  And at the same time proves that there exists a toponym in plural even in Central Slovakia (Note 2017).

Using the example of the eastern subdialect of the Northern-Central Romani Beníšek (2017: 146) describes the form of toponyms as follows:

The locality names do not have plural forms and, besides the nominative, they normally occur only in the locative (e.g. *xudľovste* 'in Khudlovo', *kijevste* 'in Kyiv'), the ablative (*xudľovstar* 'from Khudlovo'), and the genitive (as in the noun phrase *xudľovskere roma* 'the Roma of Khudlovo').

However, if we want to construct the "traditional" or "pre-emigration" state of using toponyms, it is also necessary to mention a phenomenon which has been only sparsely described in literature for spoken Romani, i.e. leaving out the adaptive morphemes in the nominative and accusative cases or even their non-syntactic usage. As Červenka (1996: 102) shows on the example of personal names:

"In the accusative – unlike the other cases – there still exists the tendency not to use the ending (I have noticed *le Janos Daroci, le Josel*). However, in the other cases (except the vocative) which in fact adds a preposition to the accusative ending the writers are 'forced' to add this ending to the loanword to be able to form the case (e.g. *le Janošistar, le Joselistar, Emiliha Ščukaha*)".

The above mentioned tendency in a close subdialect, although also in personal names only, is confirmed and even considered obligatory by Beníšek (2017: 46-47): "Furthermore, personal names that end in a consonant are invariably inflected as nonintegrated xenoclitic masculine forms, such as *ruslan-Ø* 'Ruslan', in the oblique, before Layer II suffixes, *ruslan-o-s-* (e.g. DAT *ruslanoske* 'to Ruslan'). Examples with the personal names also provide evidence that such loanwords remain non-integrated even in the accusative, i.e. in those contexts in which the oblique marking independent of the Layer II suffixes would otherwise be expected."

## b) Situation in Vlax Romani

Even for the Vlax (Lovari) Romani there exists no systematic description of the form and behaviour of toponyms for simple reference and certain reconstruction is necessary: for the situation of the Vlax Romani before migration to Western Europe there are the following characteristics resulting from the data by Elšík, Hajská, and Ort 2016[13]:

Toponyms have a noticeable tendency to adapt with the help of adaptive morphemes. E.g. masculine forms usually end in -o and feminine forms in -a[14]. As is the case with the Northern-Central Romani, the gender and number of Romani toponyms are often different from both Czech and Slovak but there are also noticeable differences between the Vlax and Northern-Central Romani in gender and number.

In the Vlax Romani there is also an apparent tendency for the feminine singular to be used when toponyms are formed. Unlike in the Northern-Central Romani the plural hardly even exists in the Vlax Romani adapted toponyms[15]. E.g. Most, the name of a Czech town, (masculine, singular) sounds *o Mosti* (plural, probably masculine) in the Northern-Central Romani but *o Mosto* (masculine, singular) in the Vlax Romani.

---

13   + information by Hajská, 2017.

14   In this case, however, the adaptive morpheme corresponds to the Slovak ending in feminine forms so the adapted version is not so obvious.

15   The topic, however, will need more thorough analysis in the future: in the recently obtained recording from Ostrava the respondent uses surprising and elsewhere unknown plural forms of names of big Czech towns which have a singular form in the language of origin: *andaj Prahi* – "from Prague" and *andaj Libercura* – "from Liberec" (recording from March 30, 2017).

The toponym *o Požono* – "Bratislava" is an example which is interesting from several points of view. Besides that there exists a variant *i Braťislava* in the Vlax dialects in Eastern Slovakia, the local Roma, however, know the expression *Požono* as an archaism. Also the masculine form of the name *Požono* contrasting with the feminine *e Požoma* in Northern-Central Romani[16] is interesting[17].

Other interesting examples of traditional toponyms are[18] *i Prága* – „Prague"[19], *i Viedňa* – „Vienna"[20], *i Sombata* – „Trnava"[21], *i Topolčáňa* – „Topolčany"[22], *o Krížo* – „Žiar nad Hronom"[23], *i Pišťaňa* or *Péšťaňa* – „Piešťany"[24], *i Senca* – „Senec"[25], *i Ohaja* – „Dolný Ohaj"[26], *i Ujvára* – „Nové Zámky"[27], *i Berna* – „Brno"[28], *i Karša* – „Košice"[29].

I have addressed the "tendency" in the pre-emigration Lovari Romani to adapt toponyms, but also cases of mere switching of the code in naming localities have been noticed, i.e. absence of adaptation. However, this model – which is very important for our topic – is reserved only for the localities that are geographically or socio-culturally remote for speakers, i.e. for localities whose names are not normally used in the given subdialect of Vlax Romani. Therefore we then encounter different varieties of names of some Slovak towns: e.g. the expression for "Partizánske"[30] is *i Partizána*[31] but the Vlax Romani without closer contact with the town use the variant *le Partizánske* which is a very non-typical plural, moreover without the adaptive ending, i.e., strictly speaking, code switching. The name of the town "Zlaté Moravce" is a similar case. The primary name in Vlax Romani is *o Marouto*[32] but the Vlax Roma without closer contact with the town use the variant *le Zlaté Moravce* which is also unadapted, plural, but also non-typically two-word.

Unlike Northern-Central Romani, in Vlax Romani the toponyms denominating towns outside the area of former Czechoslovakia are not distinguished by fundamentally different morphosyntactic behaviour than the local names. E.g. to express the

---

16  As I have mentioned, it also has the variant *Braťislava*, especially in localities that are more remote from Bratislava.

17   For detailed information about Romani toponyms for "Bratislava", see Elšík 2017.

18  As a precautionary reminder I would like to mention that I still follow the data by Elšík, Hajská, and Ort (op. cit.)

19  In this case also the name of the Czech town is adopted from the Hungarian form which does not happen in Northern-Central Romani.

20  The name of the Austrian city formed from the Slovak form – Vienna, however, is often called *o Bejči* (which at the same time is an expression for Austria).

21  Formed from the same origin (Hungarian name) and the same gender and number (feminine singular) as in Northern-Central Romani.

22  The plural of the Slovak name is again adapted as the feminine singular.

23  Conservation of the historical state: until 1955 the name of the town was Svätý Kríž nad Hronom.

24  Feminine singular, also the regional variants are interesting.

25  Gender conversion into a feminine.

26  A feminine adapted from a masculine and a one-word name instead of a two-word name.

27  Three phenomena are worth mentioning here: adaptation from a Hungarian name, feminine form, and tendency to form one-word names.

28  The name of the Czech town which is a neuter in the original and its gender varies in Northern-Central Romani is solely feminine in Vlax Romani.

29  Unlike in Northern-Central Romani the adaptation from the Hungarian and Slovak forms does not vary and also the form is extended by the phone "r". Also e.g. unlike in Northern-Central Romani there does not exist the variant *\*Prešovo* for "Prešov", always the more traditional variant *Perješi* has been attested.

30  Neuter, singular.

31  Feminine, singular.

32  Masculine, singular.

meaning "in a locality/from a locality" the prepositions *ende/anda* are used in both. Also, as has been shown on the example of both names for Vienna, they usually are singular as well and fully adapted. This, however, applies to names of localities abroad where the contact had been traditional until about the 1960s.

The mere question-form data, however, suggest the emergence of a new paradigm which is going to be one of the main topics of my article and concerns both the investigated Romani communities: the towns that have become the object of migration since the 1970s, especially in Western Europe, may already have an unadapted form: *o Malmé*[33] – "Malmö", *o Brusel*[34] – "Brussels", etc.

### c) Summary

Summing up the above mentioned sources of the traditional form of toponyms in both the dialects (and adding my own intensive experience with the Northern-Central dialect of Romani[35] and a similar experience Markéta Hajská had with the Lovari dialect[36]) I get several important characteristics:

1. Both Northern-Central and Vlax Romani have specific locality names for villages in the Czech or Slovak territory. They do differ from the official name in the majority language but at the same time they are always adapted from the contact language never originating directly from Romani.[37] However, different source languages may be used for adaptation of names:

a) The source is the official contemporary form from standard Czech or Slovak. In Northern-Central Romani in Czech localities the source is always the Czech language and adaptation of Czech names is also distinctly prevalent in Vlax Romani where also names of Czech localities loaned from other languages can be observed. For names of localities in Slovakia in both the investigated dialects borrowing from standard Slovak is only one of several possibilities, although this possibility is prevalent. Example: *Ružomberkos* ("Ružomberok").

b) a much rarer source is a demonstrably dialectal form of the contemporary official language: In Northern-Central Romani there is an attested form *Ceplička* ("Liptovská Teplička"), for Vlax Romani no such data are available.

c) For both the investigated dialects the Hungarian language is a relatively frequent source of toponyms for Slovak villages (from areas with Hungarian settlement or from the era of Hungarian state administration): E.g. the expression *Sombata* – "Trnava" is the same for both dialects.

d) Also German or its local dialects from the era of German settlement in Slovakia is a frequent source for naming localities on Slovakia: e.g. *Kubacha*[38] – "Spišské Bystré". There probably also exists a local name of German origin in Vlax Romani but currently no such data are available.

2. For names of localities outside the Czech territory the toponyms also result from

---

33  Instead of the expected *\*o Malmo* or *\*i Malma*. Source: field journals and raw recordings by Markéta Hajská from her earlier research of the Vlax Romani, esp. in Sweden.

34  Not *\*o Bruselo* or *\*i Brusela* (recording from July 31, 2015, Leicester).

35  More than 25 years.

36  About 15 years.

37  It would of course be interesting to explain my whole topic in a wider a context of borowings in Romani (e.g. Elšík, Matras, 2006: 41-43 and many others), but this would make my article too extensive.

38  Historically Kubach, Kubachy (from German Kuhbach "Cow Stream"). Until 1948 the form Kubachy was the official name of the village.

adaptation into Romani. The source then is either the original (e.g. *Berlina* – "Berlin" where, however, the Czech and Slovak forms are the same as the German one) or the Czech or Slovak form of these names (e.g. *Pariža* – "Paris", Slovak Paríž). In Vlax Romani, however, the names of foreign towns in Western Europe where the Roma have migrated roughly since the 1970s are not necessarily fully adapted (e.g. *o Brusel* – "Brussels" instead of the expected adapted *\*o Bruselo*[39]. It even turns out that this "non-adaptive" model worked in local subdialects of Lovari Romani even before the beginning of the modern migrations also for towns in Slovakia the given speakers had no contact with.

3. Adaptations are absolutely prevalent in the morphosyntactic forms of Romani names. It means that loaned names are provided with Romani adaptive morphemes[40] and thus they enter syntactic constructions.

4. Gender and number conversion is no exception in adaptation – a name may be of a different gender and number in Romani than the source name. It is possible to observe certain tendencies within these categories: e.g. in Western Slovakia there is a much stronger tendency in Northern-Central Romani to form names in the feminine singular. In Vlax Romani the tendency to form feminine singulars seems to be clearer and is not conditioned by regions. Another trend that is interesting (and important for my topic) is forming locality names outside the Czechoslovak territory in feminine singular. This is a common trend in all the Northern-Central Romani dialects. The above mentioned tendency is present also in Vlax Romani, but it cannot be proved as deviation from the tendency to form toponyms as feminine singulars in this dialect in general. Differences between Northern-Central and Vlax Romani (e.g. the Northern-Central feminine *e Požoma* vs the Lovari masculine *o Požono* – "Bratislava") in gender or number in toponyms of the same origin are no exception either.

5. In Northern-Central Romani names of localities outside the Czechoslovak territory traditionally behave differently in syntax: while the meaning "in a locality/from a locality" is expressed for Czech and Slovak villages by locative/ablative (or dialectally by prepositional phrases *ke /khatar*), for names of localities outside the Czechoslovak territory this is always expressed by prepositional phrases *and(r)e /andal (pal)*. In Vlax Romani this contrast is non-existent, the above mentioned meanings are always expressed by the prepositions *ande /anda (pa)* corresponding to the Northern-Central *and(r)e /andal (pal)*.

6. Except for some exceptions Romani local names are one-word which applies even when the source name is multi-word (e.g. the above mentioned Northern-Central *Ceplička* ("Liptovská Teplička") or Vlax *o Novejši* ("Pečovská Nová Ves").

7. In both investigated dialects there quite often exist two lexical forms of a name for localities in Slovakia. One is more traditional, more different from the contemporary official form of the name – it is used by the communities for whom the locality is somehow important, usually geographically closer (e.g. *Požoma*[41]/*Požono*[42] – "Bratislava"). The other is loaned from the contemporary official form of the name (*Braťislava*) and is usually used by the Roma from more distant localities with no close traditional relationship to the locality. Besides these couples we may observe

---

39  In accordance with the linguistic convention I use an asterisk to mark a hypothetical, unattested, or non-existent expression.

40  With the above mentioned exceptions for some more recently loaned Vlax Romani names.

41  Northern-Central Romani.

42  Lovari Romani.

also varieties in gender or number. An example from Northern-Central Romani: *o Brnos/ e Brna* – "Brno".

8. A very important characteristic of toponyms that will be addressed again later in this article is the custom – consensuality of a specific name within one local community or community of relatives. Names of localities mostly vary within Northern-Central Romani, or Czecho-Slovak Lovari Romani, as a whole, while a single consensual variant is usually the rule in one local community or community of relatives.[43]

### 1.2. The form of toponyms in the "post-migration" situation

#### a) Situation in Northern-Central Romani

In Northern-Central Romani migration causes several noticeable changes in the form and use of toponyms for new localities in Britain. It is interesting that according to the existing data it is not possible to detect dependence of these changes on the length of stay[44] or the intensity of contact with the new environment[45], on the English language competency or on the fact whether the respondent was staying in Slovakia or Great Britain at the time of the interview.[46] What follows is the survey of changes:

#### 1. Unadapted names

The names of new localities in Britain are no longer adapted and in fact they formally become products of code switching[47]. This practice is in contradiction not only with the customary formation of toponyms for "home", i.e. Czech or Slovak localities, but also with the custom of naming localities abroad. New local names do not have Romani adaptive endings and their form rather imitates the original pronunciation of the English toponyms.

Therefore there occur the following forms of toponyms for places in north England: *Pitrboro* ("Peterborough", the adapted form would probably sound *\*e Pitrbora* or *\*o Pitrboros*)[48], *Šefild* ("Sheffield", the adapted form would sound *\*e Šefilda* or *\*o Šefildos*)[49], *Tinzli* ("Tinsley", a suburban part of Sheffield, the adapted form would sound *\*e Tinzla* or *\*o Tinzlos*)[50], *Gridlis* ("Gleadless Valley", a part of Sheffield, the adapted form would sound *\*e Glidlisa* in the case of a feminine, *\*o Glidlisos* in the

---

43  For accuracy's sake: it is possible that generation shift occurs in some localities where the older generation uses the more traditional name while the name originating from the contemporary Slovak one spreads among the young generation. However, not enough research has been realized dealing with this topic. In fact it even seems that Romani conserves historical names of Hungarian or German origin much more than the local custom among Slovak speakers.

44  Recordings from 2005 – 2016 have been analysed and members of different migration generations speak in them.

45  Not only utterances of men and children whose contact with the English-speaking environment is usually more intensive thanks to their going to work or school have been analysed but also utterances of women whose contact with English is limited.

46  Recordings and notes from each of both the environments represented about 50%.

47  This of course is a daring statement for the sake of clearness. It might apply if we did not take the article and proper inclusion of toponyms in a sentence into consideration (and also the above mentioned possibility to use proper names without adaptive morphemes in nominative in Northern-Central Romani). On the other hand the character of new toponyms which is closer to imitation will be shown soon herein which partly supports the hypothesis on code switching.

48  Unadapted form attested in recordings:A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I.

49  Unadapted form attested in recordings:A, J, C, D, E, I.

case of a masculine)[51], *Picmor* ("Pitsmoor", a suburban part of Sheffield, the adapted form would sound *\*e Picmora* or *\*o Picmoros*)[52], *Rotherham* ("Rotherham", the adapted form would sound *\*e Rotherhama* or *\*o Rotherhamos*)[53], *Menčester* ("Manchester", the adapted form would sound *\*e Menčestra* or *\*o Menčestros*)[54].

In most of the submitted recordings the respective names repeatedly occur in their unadapted form which is confirmed also by personal communication with researchers and the electronic communication of the respondents. In total I have noticed only 3 exceptions from the above mentioned rule each of which is of a slightly different character:

The expressions *e Londina* ("London"), *andre Londina* ("in London")[55] have been noticed repeatedly. I believe that this proof rather represents a residuum of the pre-emigration model of formation of toponyms. This is already suggested by the fact that the form is derived from the Slovak word instead of the English one (that would sound *\*andre Londona*), then it is suggested by the feminine form and the fact that it refers to a well-known city, and finally by the fact that the other British localities in the same recording are always denominated by toponyms that have not been adapted. The other two exceptions from the described model are in close relation with the morphosyntactic behaviour of loan words; therefore I will address them and comment on them later.

### 2. Masculine singular

All new toponyms are solely masculine and singular.[56] There are two reasons why it is interesting: For one thing the unadapted names have different endings and the toponym *Tinzli* would rather suggest a plural form in Romani. Moreover, the masculine unification contradicts the traditional tendency to denominate towns, especially abroad, by feminine forms.

### 3. Prepositional constructions

As a matter of principle new toponyms in other than nominative meaning are connected to sentences by prepositional constructions, not by the locative or ablative: e.g. *andro Picmor* ("in Pitsmoor", recording A), *ando Menčester* ("in Manchester", recording E), *andal o Petiboro* ("from Peterborough", recording I). If the information is related to the fact that the towns concerned are foreign towns, it in fact means continuation of the previous state, as Northern-Central Romani town names outside the Czechoslovak territory had behaved in this way even before the modern emigration.

---

50   Unadapted form attested in recordings: A, C, E, O.

51   Unadapted form attested in recording: A. It is interesting, however, that the traditional model of a one-word toponym has been preserved. I write about name variations (here clearly audible r instead of l) below.

52   Unadapted form attested in recording:A.

53   Unadapted form attested in recordings: A, C, O.

54   Unadapted form attested in recording: E.

55   Recordings: D (a man, about 45 years old, living in England, solely and repeatedly – three times), recording A (this speaker, however, varies *andro Londýna*, *andre Londýn*, *andro Londýn*, i.e. he more often creates the unadapted form based on the Slovak name for "London", recording K (*andro Londína*), on the other hand, in the recording there is only the variant *and(r)o Londýn*, twice, (which in fact is a form according to a new model, it is an unadapted masculine, but it is interesting that it again comes from the Slovak and not the English version of the toponym).

56   Because of the absence of adaptive endings the grammatical gender is expressed by articles that may be integrated into prepositions: e.g. *andro Pitrboro* ("in Peterborough") and not the hypothetical *\*andre Pitrboro*.

Prepositional constructions at the same time make the existence of unadapted proper names possible without them being heterogeneous elements.[57]. It is clear, however, that the new toponyms join sentences syntactically: there are always expressions of the type *andro Šefild* (with the article integrated in the preposition) and not *\*andre Sheffield* which would signalize a proper change of the code.

I noticed two interesting exceptions in the corpus: In one of the recordings the adapted form of the proper name *Lidsos* ("Leeds") with an unadapted variant Lids: "bo mandar jehkvar phučľas e Angličanka, Lidsos... andro Lids mandar..."[58]. In my opinion the form of the quotation does not show a real exception but rather a situation of transition: the speaker starts to say the name for "Leeds" with the traditional adaptive morpheme which at the same time forms the obliquus (and she probably intends to use the traditional locative phrase *\*Lidsoste*) but probably realizes how strange the traditional phrase sounds in connection with a British town, corrects herself and uses a prepositional phrase with the unadapted form. In the same recording the new form is confirmed after a while by the prepositional phrase *andro Lids* ("in Leeds" and *pal o Lids* ("from Leeds").

A real exception then is an adapted form of a toponym in the locative phrase that has been noticed: *me bešav Kardifoste* ("I live in Cardiff")[59]. This is in contradiction with the new custom, brings the model which is usual for behaviour of toponyms for Slovak or Czech villages and thus in fact leaves the tradition established for towns abroad. It is also interesting that thanks to his works this speaker (the other Roma in the recording do not use such forms or phrases) is in an intensive contact with English which is a language using prepositional phrases.

### 4. Non-existence of consensual variants of toponyms

One of the most distinctive features of new toponyms is their unsettled character. Names of British towns or suburbs do not remain only unadapted: despite the speakers' long stay abroad no set forms of the names are formed in Romani and their pronunciation is in fact only imitated by individual speakers.[60]. This brings varieties of different forms in which it is not possible to detect dependence on the length of the migration experience, the country of current residence, and especially on family relations. Although the whole investigated community is related, its members keep social contact and of course share the same Romani subdialect, the forms of town names are very varied. They even vary within closer families (e.g. in siblings or married couples) and even within individual speeches. This was not the case at the time they lived in Slovakia.

The English names for the two places where the members of the given community most frequently stay (and thus the only ones noticed in a significant number of recordings) vary in Romani as follows:

---

57  To be precise, this in fact is coordination of three grammatical rules: (1) Proper names in Northern-Central Romani have articles. (2) Preposition with an article is always followed by the nominative, not only in proper names. 3. The nominative is one of the minority of cases that do not need the ending of the obliquus and therefore do not need adaptive morphemes.

58  "Because one English lady once asked, Leeds... in Leeds asked me". (Recording L)

59  Recording E.

60  It cannot be denied, however, that the way the close relatives pronounce certain toponyms in Romani may have a substantial influence on the form of a name used by a specific speaker. On the other hand distinctive differences even between the closest relatives can be observed quite frequently.

"Peterborough":

*Pitrboro*[61], *Peterboro*[62], *Pitiboro*[63], *Piteboro*[64], *Piterboro*[65], *Pitiborou*[66], *Pitborou*[67], *Petiboro*[68], *Piterboro* next to *Píterboro*[69], *Pitrboro* next to *Pitiboro*[70], *Pitiboro* next to *Piterboro*[71].

"Sheffield":

*Šefild*[72], *Šefld*[73], *Šefl*[74], *Šefeld*[75], *Šefl* next to *Šefld*[76] and even four variants *Šefl*, *Šefld*, *Šefild* and *Šefíld*[77] occurring simultaneously in a speech by a single speaker.

For "Rotherham" a locality occurring only three times in the recordings, even 2 different variants of pronunciation: *Roterdam*[78], *Rotherham*[79] have been found.

Also, one variant appeared in the name for "Tinsley". Though almost all Roma pronounce the toponym as *Tinzli*[80], there is also the variant *Tizli*[81].

The rich variety of these imitations of the original name is surprising especially in the closest relatives or within individual speeches, but it is also interesting within the whole community.

### 5. Conservative form of toponyms for Czech and Slovak towns

In the language of the contemporary migrants the forms and morphosyntactic behaviour of names of the source localities from the Czech or Slovak territory represent an interesting contrast to the new toponyms. Not only their lexical origins are preserved

---

61 This form attested in recording: E, while the wife of this respondent is consistent in her using the variant *Piteboro* in the recording.
62 This form attested in recording: B.
63 Thus attested in recordings: G, H, and aslo recording I, while the husband, on the contrary, clearly uses the form *Petiboro* in the same recording.
64 This form attested in recording: E, while the husband of the respondent uses the variant *Pitrboro*.
65 Thus attested in recordings: A, and also recording C: one of the sisters uses this variant as a matter of principle, the other clearly prefers the variant *Pitiboro*.
66 Thus attested in recording: F, while the other sister uses the variant *Pitrborou* there.
67 Thus attested in recording: I, while the husband, on the contrary, clearly uses the form *Petiboro* in the same recording.
68 Thus attested in recording: I, while the wife, on the contrary, clearly uses the form *Pitborou* in the same recording.
69 Thus attested in recording: D (the shorter variant occurs more frequently but even the longer variant is pronounced clearly).
70 Thus attested in recording: A.
71 Recording C: however, there is a distinct tendency to use the variant *Pitiboro*, the respondent's sister in the same recording prefers the variant *Piterboro* as a matter of principle.
72 Thus attested in recording: C, but the other sister uses the variant *Šefld* in the same recording.
73 Thus attested in recordings: C, but the other sister uses the variant *Šefild* in the same recording, I (here it is even possible that the speaker pronounces another variant *Šefl*).
74 Thus attested in recording: D.
75 Thus attested in recording: I.
76 Thus attested in recording: E.
77 Thus attested in recording: A. Here it is interesting though, that the toponym for "Peterborough" does not vary in this speaker .
78 Thus attested in recording: A. Possible contamination by the name of a better known city in the Netherlands.
79 Thus attested in recordings: C, O. The group "th" is really pronounced like the Romani aspirated th.
80 Thus attested in recordings: A, C, E.
81 Thus attested once in recording: O.

within a community (e.g. a local expression of German or Hungarian origin is not re-placed by a more official Slovak variant)[82] but also the way of expressing the meaning "in a locality" and "from a locality" remains traditional, i.e. it is formed by cases, not by prepositional constructions. Traditional names for the source localities of the branched Czecho-Slovak Romani community are also preserved in the feminine singular[83] although the same names have different grammatical categories in the majority languages.

Both models of toponyms then frequently meet in the speeches of respondents (maybe even in one sentence): the traditional model for Czech or Slovak localities and the progressive model for British localities.

### b) Situation in Vlax Romani

#### 1. Unadapted names

It is remarkable that in the case of migration to Western Europe there occur some phenomena in denominating towns within the community of Lovari Romani speakers that are similar to those we can observe in speakers of the Northern-Central dialect and this happens without any intensive communication between the two communities. Similarly to Northern-Central Romani it is not possible to detect dependence of these changes on the length of the migration experience or the country of residence at the time of the interview. As I have mentioned, the seeds of the former of the phenomena – the use of unadapted forms of toponyms – may date in Lovari Romani back to the 1960s or 1970s. It lacks consistence but the denomination of the quite old migration destination *o Malmé* ("Malmö") instead of the expected *\*e Malma* or *\*o Malmo*, or e.g. the plural of Flemish origin *o Antverpen* (instead of the feminine singular *\*e Antverpa* or plural *\*o Antverpura*) and the other above mentioned examples show that this phenomenon did not start to occur until as late as in the mid-1990s as is the case with Northern-Central Romani speakers.

In the new migration since the 1990s, however, the described model becomes – like in the case of Northern-Central Romani – a rule. Let us concentrate on the form of the name Leicester, the town which was the destination for the investigated community: as the most frequent form *o Lejčestr* ("Leicester") is not adapted in Northern-Central Romani, the properly adapted form would have to be *\*o Lejčestro* leaving aside the traditional tendency in Vlax Romani to form feminine toponyms. In Vlax Romani, however, there already starts a new process that has not been observed in Northern-Central Romani yet: it is a secondary turning of a name into Romani using the traditional model (including the fact that it is feminine), this time using also the correct English pronunciation of the toponym: among younger Vlax Roma who are in more intensive contact with the British or Vlax Roma from communities other than Eastern-Slovak Lovara the variant *\*i Lestra* is spreading. Also the popular video clips in social networks thematizing

---

82  To have the full picture: among hundreds of examples there exists an only exception in the recording M, where a young man used an unusual variant of the name of a Slovak village which was closer to the official name. This fact may be interpreted in different ways, e.g. by his worry that despite their competency in Romani the interviewers from the Czech Republic will not understand the traditional local name.

83  In accordance with Dobruská (2017) for the sake of anonymity I do not mention the names of the source localities in Romani and it is not necessary for my topic as they do not vary.

the feeling of being Leicester Roma, for example *Ame sam Rom anda Lestra* ("We are Roma from Leicester")[84], certainly have an important influence here.

Like in Northern-Central Romani, also the denomination of the capital is extraordinary and interesting. Many Lovari dialecs speakers say *Londýn*[85]. It means that even in Vlax Romani this name exists without adaptation but it has been loaned from the Slovak version. And the form is not settled, like in Northern-Central Romani: some Vlax Roma say *ando London* and others *ando Landn*. A common feature of all these variants is that they are not adapted into Romany, i.e. the forms *\*o Londino* or *\*o Landno*, *\*o Londono*, etc. have not been observed.

### 2. Masculine singular

Like in Northern-Central Romani the new toponyms are always masculine which somehow contradicts the tradition[86]. Not only the example *o Lejčester* but also denominations of other places in North England prove that[87].

### 3. Non-existence of consensual variants of toponyms[88]

Like in Northern-Central Romani it is possible to observe a surprising instability of the form of new toponyms despite the speaker's quite long stay in the locality (often more than 10 years). This has been shown by the above mentioned contrasting variants *o Leičester* x *i Lestra* but these might suggest just certain development with gradual adaptation. In Lovari Romani, however, there also exist variants next to each other that do not mean development but just instability: on 27 May, 2017 Hajská[89] recorded a conversation via Skype where the speaker living in Leicester for a long time systematically used the variant *o Lenčestr* for this town. Hajská[90] at the same time mentions the variants *Lečester*, *Lenčester*, or *Lejcester*.

Other interesting variants are represented by the names of towns where Northern-Central Romani speakers live. In a recording from 27 May, 2017 the question where Roma live in England was deliberately asked and more variants of towns known from the varieties in Northern-Central Romani occurred: *ando Pítrsburou* ("in Petersborough"), *ando Šefíld* ("in Sheffield").

### 4. Conservative form of toponyms for Czech and Slovak towns

As for the names of the source localities, they remain (like in the Northern-Central Romani) the same as the pre-emigration situation. It is especially striking in the cases where the traditional name differs lexically from the official Slovak form. E.g. the town of Prešov is even by young Lovari migrants, whose experience with this locality

---

84  A clip demonstrably shared from YouTube in Facebook conversation within the community in May 2017: www.youtube.com/watch?v=QJE7kmpWpzA (last visited 2017-12-31).

85  E.g. recording N. The form *Londýn* is both Czech and Slovak name for "London".

86  Here of course I do not mean the mentioned most progressive model *i Lestra* which has not fully spread.

87  *O Šefíld*, *o Bradford, o Pítrsburou* – recording from May 27, 2017, Žatec district (Czech Republic).

88  For comparison I would like to add that the use of prepositional constructions I investigate in the case of Northern-Central Romani is not substantial for Lovari Romani as prepositional constructions have always been used in it for both home and foreign localities. Therefore the section on Lovari Romani is one chapter shorter.

89  Personal message.

90  Field journals 2015 and 2016 and additional analysis of the raw recordings from this period.

is much weaker, called traditionally *o Perješi* the name is not replaced by the variant closer to the contemporary name *(\*o Prešovo)*.

### c) Summary

1. Even on migration to Western Europe, especially to Great Britain, both Northern-Central and Vlax (Lovari) Romani borrow toponyms from majority languages. These are always the local languages, in our case especially English. The only proved exception is the name of the city of London which has two variants existing next to each other, from the English (*London*) and the Slovak (*Londýn*) forms. The Slovak language even seems to prevail in the case of this city in both the Romani dialects. This can probably be explained by the tradition in denominating this city which was well known even before migration.

2. The names of the source localities (or villages and towns in the Czech and Slovak territory) remain unchanged even after a longer stay of the speakers in the West: in the given related community they are derived from the same origins (although they are different from the official name of the village), they are adopted in the same way and also their syntactic behaviour is the same: in Northern-Central Romani the meaning "in a locality" and "from a locality" is expressed by case constructions, in Lovari Romani by prepositional phrases.

3. While names of localities outside the Czechoslovak territory traditionally used to be also adapted into Romani in both dialects, by migration to the West[91] the paradigm completely changes at this point: morphological adaptations completely disappears in both dialects and the toponyms themselves, although provided with articles and included into sentences, have rather the form of code switching than loanwords. It is strange, especially because both dialects have had a long experience with adaptation of toponyms from different languages varying both genetically and typologically (Slovak, German and Hungarian). Therefore hypothetical adapted forms for new English toponyms can be easily constructed as shown above.

4. In both dialects new toponyms contradict the tradition of solely masculine gender (in both dialects with the exception of denomination of London varying in gender which – as I have mentioned – is rather a relic of tradition).

5. As new toponyms are coincidentally nominative[92] in sentence patterns in both dialects, they enter sentences unadapted with the help of prepositional constructions and at this point there is even no detectable deviation from the pre-emigration custom.

6. The tradition of one-word names of localities continues (even in the cases where the original is multi-word, e.g. *o Gridlis* – "Gleadless Valley").

7. The traditional contrast between the variants of names from Roma who know the locality closely (usually the more traditional form) and from Roma with no relationship to it (usually adaptation from the more official form) continues to exist for denominating localities in Slovakia of the Czech Republic. Toponyms for English names do vary much more but in an absolutely individual manner as will be shown in the following clause.

---

91  In Lovari Romani selectively for some localities since as early as the 1960s/70s, in both dialects then fully at least since the mid 1990s.

92  In Lovari Romani the given meanings are traditionally always expressed in this manner, in Northern-Central Romani it is so only in localities abroad.

8. In the section on traditional toponyms I mentioned that one of their very important features is the consensual character of a specific name within one local or related community. At this point the situation has changed into a complete opposite, surprisingly in both dialects. Romani speakers rather imitate the original English names, everyone according to their personal competences of preferences and different variants can be found not only across a related community, but even in married couples or siblings the forms of toponyms differ, and even some individuals use different variants. Moreover, the above mentioned variability does not disappear even after many years of the speakers' stay in Britain.

9. Moreover, the whole model of new unadapted masculine toponyms for British towns is replicated also in the home community in Slovakia and used by people with no personal migration experience.

## 2. CONCLUSION

In my article I tried to investigate the changes occurring in two different Romani dialects due to migration of their speakers from Slovakia to Great Britain. From the very beginning it seemed to be most useful to concentrate on the most evident topic: formation and usage of toponyms, specifically names of towns. The fact is that this subject was one of the least expected language consequences of migration. Also its similar realization in both the communities living neither in Slovakian nor in Great Britain in the same localities and hardly ever communicating with each other is surprising. Another reason to concentrate on a single topic is the fact that the interesting subject of toponyms has not been systematically described in either of the investigated dialects even for the pre-emigration situation, especially not in the ethnological literature. Therefore it was necessary to begin with description of the referential state as it existed before migration to the West.

As I have shown, Romani toponyms have always been the result of language contact. However, the changes investigated in my article are more the result of a new life and language situation than of a specific influence of English on the structure of Romani.

I have come to the following results:

1. On migration to Western Europe both Northern-Central and Vlax (Lovari) Romani continue the tradition of loaning of toponyms from majority languages but the paradigm changes identically in both the investigated dialects: the so far existing morphological adaptation of the source names with the help of adaptive morphemes is completely abandoned. It is strange, especially because both the dialects have a long-time experience with adaptation of toponyms from various languages differing both genetically and typologically and so names adapted from English would present no problem in either dialect.[93] Denominations of the source localities (or villages and towns in Czech and Slovak territory), however, remain perfectly unchanged even after a longer stay in the West: they get derived from the same historical origins[94] within a given related community and are still adapted in the traditional manner.

---

93   Also, lot of the names for traditional Slovak localities come from the languages Roma are not competent in (Hungarian, German) and even the names originating from Slovak forms differ in gender or number from Slovak and/or within the particular Romani dialect. That is why I hesitate to accept the

2. In both the dialects new toponyms are solely masculine which also rather contradicts the tradition. On the contrary the toponyms for the Czech and Slovak source localities keep the original grammatical categories. This is remarkable especially in Northern-Central Romani where they keep their traditional form of a feminine singular, although they are of different categories in their respective source languages.

3. Consensuality is a very important characteristic of traditional Romani toponyms: the name of a specific village usually does not vary within one local or related community. This consensuality completely changes due to migration to Western Europe and an unusual variety does not disappear even after a many-year stay of the whole community in one locality. For example even after ten years of stay it seems that the individual Romani speakers rather imitate the original English pronunciation of names according to their individual competences or preferences. I have described the unexpected number of variants of individual names that differ not only across a related community but also e.g. in married couples of siblings. Even some individuals use more different variants of the same name.

4. The whole described model of the opposition of new and traditional toponyms is replicated even in the home community in Slovakia; it is used even by people with no personal migration experience.

The whole change of the paradigm of Romani toponyms may generate questions and hypotheses which, however, should be only carefully suggested and subjected to further investigation in the future. Also there are differences in how much the detected individual changes are surprising or serious. Let us compare two of my most remarkable findings:

A) In my opinion the radical abandoning of adapting town names into Romani and their usage as unadapted masculine forms might be explained by the intensity of the change. As I have shown, the traditional system of adaptation of toponyms concerned genetically and typologically different languages, nevertheless, it may have stabilized also thanks to a long-time language contact with the source languages speakers and among Roma communicating with one another. On the other hand the new migration hastily threw quite large communities into contact with unknown West-European languages; some respondents had even lived in several West-European countries during the last few decades. The need to immediately handle toponyms of unknown origin and structure thus might have created the need to facilitate communication by partial code-switching without waiting for formation of adapted consensual Romani forms. This hypothesis might also correspond with the unification of new toponyms as singular masculine forms which may have been perceived as neutral and thus more suitable for incomplete adaptation of words that speakers did not consider to be properly adapted Romani words.

The fact that the above mentioned state has continued independently in both the investigated dialects even after more than ten years can also be explained within this hypothesis: the new language paradigm had come into being faster than the overall

---

suggestion to explain the new situation by unstable bilingualism in new language (as it was suggested by one of the peer reviews of my article).

94  I mention in the article that the choice of the source for adaptation of a toponym usually depends on the extent of the contact the speakers from the given community have with the locality – it means that the further in terms of time, social situation, or geography the community is, the more probable it is that it will adapt the current official Slovak name.

language adaptation to the new situation and begun to replicate. Thus it may have become an integral part of both the dialects to be used for denominating West-European localities which will have to be taken into account in their future grammatical descriptions. This, by the way, would also correspond with replication of the above mentioned model in the source localities in Slovakia.

B) In comparison to the above mentioned phenomenon it is more difficult to explain the high tendency of the individual new toponyms to vary. One of the reasons for this situation certainly is the low competency of the speakers in English; however, the traditional model of toponyms was not dependent on competency in the source language, either[95]. Therefore it is possible that either the need to exactly denominate a certain town or the need of this specific form of language manifestation of being insiders has just weakened. It might also suggest other ways of self-identification of a group after having moved to a large multicultural city abroad.

What development of this phenomenon may be expected in future generations?[96] If the individually motivated imitation of the original name has really become the new custom for toponyms, I think that future decline of the above described variability may be predicted. When the generation of current children grows up and is fully competent in English, the tendency to vary will be naturally weakened as names of towns will be close to their original pronunciation. Another possible alternative is suggested by the type *i Lestra* which has even now been observed as minor in Vlax Romani. It would mean additional formation of consensual traditional type toponyms even for British names. Currently this type is marginal but its expansion cannot be ruled out, because as I have shown in my article, language development often follows unexpected routes.

REFERENCES

Beníšek, M. (2017). *Eastern Uzh varieties of North Central Romani.* Ph.D. thesis. Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Arts.

Červenka, J. (1996). *Písemná podoba slovenské romštiny*. Praha. M. A. thesis. Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Arts.

Červenka, J. (2006). *Dialektní specifika severocentrální romštiny ve středoslovenských oblastech Kysuce, Liptov a Turiec.* Prague: Signeta.

Dobruská, P. (2017). The mobility of Roma from a Slovak Village and its influence on Local Communities. In: C. Hornstein Tomić, S. Scholl-Schneider, R. Pichler (Eds.), *Remigration to post-socialist Europe: Hopes and realities of return.* Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Elšík, V., Hajská, M., Ort, J. (2016). *Slovník olašské romštiny*. Online: http://www.romistika.eu/?c_id=554&pre=1 (+ new data recorded for further development of the dictionary).

Elšík, V. (2017): The Romani oikonym Požom(b)a ,Bratislava'. In: K. Kozhanov, M. Oslon, D. W. Halwachs (Eds.), *Das amen godi pala Lev Čerenkov: Romani historija, čhib taj kultura. Grazer Romani Publikationen 5.* Graz: Karl-Franzes Universität Graz, pp. 176–187.

---

95  A typical example is a still passed on name of the source locality of the respondents – Northern-Central Romani speakers (for the sake of anonymity I do not give the name of the locality). This name comes from a language the speakers certainly do not know.

96  Supposing the competence in Romani will be preserved.

Hajská, M. (2015). Gažikanes vaj romanes? Jazykové postoje olašských Romů jedné východoslovenské komunity ke třem místně užívaným jazykům. In: T. Podolinská, T. Hrustič: *Čierno-biele svety. Rómovia v majoritnej spoločnosti na Slovensku.* Bratislava: Veda a Ústav etnológie SAV, pp. 346–373.

Hübschmannová, M., Šebková, H, Žigová, A. (1991). *Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník.* Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Kubaník, P., Sadílková, H., Červenka, J. (2013). Romani language competence and intergenerational transmission in the Czech Republic. In: B. Schrammel-Leber, B. Tiefenbacher (Eds.), *Romani V. Papers from the Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore Society, Graz 2011.* Graz: Grazer Linguistische Monographien, pp. 61–80.

Matras, Y. (Ed.) (1995). *Romani in Contact.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. (Published as a volume 126 of publishing series *Current issues in lingustic theory*.)

Matras, Y. (2002). *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pintér, T., Menyhárt, J. (2005). Bilingvizmus v Malom Háji alebo jazyková situácia v rómskej komunite na južnom Slovensku. In: J. Štefánik (Ed.), *Individuálny a spoločenský bilingvizmus.Zborník príspevkov z II. medzinárodného kolokvia o bilingvizme, 10. 11. 6. 2004, FiF UK v Bratislave.* Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, pp. 77–83.

Šebková, H., Žlnayová, E. (1998). *Nástin gramatiky slovenské romštiny (pro pedagogické účely)* Ústí nad Labem: Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně.

Šebková, H., Žlnayová, E. (1999). *Romaňi čhib – učebnice slovenské romštiny*. Prague: Fortuna.

## RESOURCES

Recordings already catalogued in the archive of the Seminar of Romani studies, Charles University, Faculty of Arts, Prague:

Recording A: 2005-10-24-02 (Eastern Slovakia)

Recording B: 2005-12-20-01 (Eastern Slovakia)

Recording C: 2006-12-01-03 (Sheffield, Great Britain)

Recording D: 2007-02-15-03 (Sheffield, Great Britain)

Recording E: 2007-02-17-03 (Sheffield, Great Britain)

Recording F: 2007-10-06-02 (Sheffield, Great Britain)

Recording G: 2007-10-10-03 (Sheffield, Great Britain)

Recording H: 2008-02-03-01 (Eastern Slovakia)

Recording I: 2008-02-04-01 (Eastern Slovakia)

Recording J: 2005-10-26-05 (Eastern Slovakia)

Recording K: 2015-07-13-01 (Eastern Slovakia)

Recording L: 2007-02-13-02 (Sheffield, Great Britain)

Recording M: 2015-07-11-01 (Eastern Slovakia)

Recording N: 2016-07-16-01 (Leicester, Great Britain)

Recording O: 2006-12-01-02 (Sheffield, Great Britain)

Raw recordings (yet not catalogued):

July 31, 2015 (Leicester, Great Britain)

March 30, 2017 (Ostrava, Czech Republic)

May 27, 2017 (Žatec district, Czech Republic)

About 10 other raw non-catalogued recordings in Vlax Romani (years 2016 – 2017)

Field journals

Interviews with Markéta Hajská, Petra Dobruská and Jan Ort (2017)

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

JAN ČERVENKA – began his studies at the underground Evening University of Czech Language and Literature in 1988. In 1990, after the Velvet Revolution, he followed his teachers to the Faculty of Arts at Charles University, where he studied Czech Language and Literature and Romani Language. His research and pedagogical interests include the written form of Romani, Romani art, Romani translatology and editology, and ethnology of the Roma. He is the co-author and academic supervisor of the official language rules of North-Central Romani in Slovakia. In 2005–2016, he was the Head of the Romani Studies Section. Selected publications in English: *Issues of lingustic correctness in Romani*. In Facuna J., Lužica R.: Spolu s Rómami dosiahneme viac / Together with Roma, we will achieve more. Bratislava, Štátny pedagogický ústav, 2016, p. 223–236; Kubaník P., Červenka J., Sadílková H.: *Romani language competence in an intergenerational transmission in the Czech Republic*. In Barbara Schrammel-Leber B.: Romani V. Papers from the Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore Society Graz 2011. Graz, treffpunkt sprachen. Plurilingualism Research Unit, 2013, p. 61–80.; *Problems in using official composed personal names in written Romani*, In: Grazer linguistische Studien 2004/61, p. 25–29.